arXiv:1704.06093v1 [math.CO] 20 Apr 2017

Independent transversal domination number of a graph *

Hongting Wang, Baoyindureng Wu †, Xinhui An
College of Mathematics and System Sciences, Xinjiang University
Urumqi, Xinjiang 830046, P.R.China

Abstract: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *dominating set* of G if every vertex in $V \setminus S$ is adjacent to a vertex of S. The *domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum dominating set of G. Furthermore, a dominating set S is an *independent transversal dominating set* of G if it intersects every maximum independent set of G. The *independent transversal domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_{it}(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum independent transversal dominating set of G. In 2012, Hamid initiated the study of the independent transversal domination of graphs, and posed the following two conjectures:

Conjecture 1. If G is a non-complete connected graph on n vertices, then $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

Conjecture 2. If G is a connected bipartite graph, then $\gamma_{it}(G)$ is either $\gamma(G)$ or $\gamma(G) + 1$.

We show that Conjecture 1 is not true in general. Very recently, Conjecture 2 is partially verified to be true by Ahangar, Samodivkin, Yero. Here, we prove the full statement of Conjecture 2. In addition, we give a correct version of a theorem of Hamid. Finally, we answer a problem posed by Martínez, Almira, and Yero on the independent transversal total domination of a graph.

Keywords: Domination number; Independence number; Covering number; Independent transversal domination number

1 Introduction

We consider undirected finite simple graphs only, and follow the notations and terminology in [3]. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph. The *order* of G is $|V(G)|$. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, the set of neighbors is denoted by $N(v)$. The degree of v, denoted by $d(v)$, is number of edges incident with v in G. Since G is simple, $d(v) = |N(v)|$. The minimum degree of G, denoted by $\delta(G)$, is $\min\{d(v) : v \in V(G)\}$. For a set $S \subseteq V(G)$, let $N(S) = \cup_{v \in S} N(v)$. A set S is

*Research supported by NSFC (No. 11571294)
†Corresponding author. Email: baoywu@163.com (B. Wu)

said to be an *independent set* of G, if no pair of vertices of S are adjacent in G. The *independence number* of G, denoted by $\alpha(G)$, is the cardinality of a maximum independent set of G. We denote by $\Omega(G)$ the set of all maximum independent sets of G.

On the other hand, S is said to be a *vertex covering* of G if every edge of G is incident with some vertex of S in G. It is easy to see that S is an independent set of G if and only if $V(G) \setminus S$ is a vertex covering of G. The vertex covering number, denoted by $\beta(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum vertex covering of G. So, for any graph G of order n,

$$\alpha(G) + \beta(G) = n. \tag{1}$$

A set $M \subseteq E(G)$ is said to be a matching of G if no pair of edges of M have a common end vertex. The matching number of G, denoted by $\alpha'(G)$, is the cardinality of a maximum matching of G. It is obvious that for a graph G of order n,

$$\alpha'(G) \leq \min\{\frac{n}{2},\ \beta(G)\}. \tag{2}$$

The well-known König-Egerváry theorem states that for a bipartite graph G,

$$\alpha'(G) = \beta(G). \tag{3}$$

A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *dominating set* of G if every vertex in $V \setminus S$ is adjacent to a vertex of S. The *domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G. A minimum dominating set of a graph G is called a $\gamma(G)$-set of G.

It is clear that for a graph G,

$$\gamma(G) \leq \alpha(G), \tag{4}$$

and if G has no isolated vertices,

$$\gamma(G) \leq \beta(G). \tag{5}$$

A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is said to be an *independent transversal* of G if $S \cap I \neq \emptyset$ for any $I \in \Omega(G)$. The *independent transversal number* of G, denoted by $\tau_i(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum independent transversal of G. A dominating set S of a graph G is said to be an *independent transversal dominating set* if $S \cap I \neq \emptyset$ for any $I \in \Omega(G)$. By the definitions above, for any graph G,

$$\max\{\gamma(G), \tau_i(G)\} \leq \gamma_{it}(G). \tag{6}$$

The notion of independent transversal domination was first introduced by Hamid [8] in 2012. He proved that for a graph G of order n, $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq n$, with equality if and only if $G \cong K_n$.

Theorem 1.1. *(Hamid [8]) For a graph G without isolated vertices, $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \beta(G) + 1$.*

Theorem 1.2. *(Hamid [8]) If G is a non-complete connected graph of order n with $\alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$, then $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$.*

In view of the above theorem, Hamid posed the following conjecture in [8].

Conjecture 1.1. *(Hamid [8]) If G is a non-complete connected graph on n vertices, then $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.*

We show that the above conjecture is not true in general. Hamid [8] showed that $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{it}(G) \leq \gamma(G) + \delta(G)$. In particular, $\gamma_{it}(T)$ is either $\gamma(T)$ or $\gamma(T) + 1$ for a tree T. So, he proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2. *(Hamid [8]) If G is a connected bipartite graph, then $\gamma_{it}(G)$ is either $\gamma(G)$ or $\gamma(G) + 1$.*

Recently, Ahangar, Samodivkin, Yero [1] proved that Conjecture 2 is valid for all unbalanced bipartite graphs.

Theorem 1.3. *(Ahangar, Samodivkin, Yero [1]) Let G be a bipartite graph with bipartition (X, Y) such that $|X| \neq |Y|$. Then, $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \gamma(G) + 1$. In particular, this is true when G has odd order.*

We show that the full statement of Conjecture 2 in the next section.
Complexity of independent transversal domination problem can be in [1].

2 Disproof of Conjecture 1.1 and Proof of Conjecture 1.2

First we begin with a useful observation.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be non-complete graph of order n. If G is the complement of a triangle-free graph, then $\tau_i(G) = \beta(\overline{G})$, and thus $\gamma_{it}(G) \geq n - \alpha(\overline{G})$.*

Proof. Since G is the complement of a triangle-free graph, $\alpha(G) = 2$. Thus, $\Omega(G) = \{\{u, v\} : uv \in E(\overline{G})\}$ and an independent transversal of G is a vertex covering of $\overline{G}$, $\tau_i(G) = \beta(\overline{G})$, and thus $\gamma_{it}(G) \geq n - \alpha(\overline{G})$. □

To disprove Conjecture 1.1, we recall a celebrated result on the Ramsey theory, due to Kim [10].

Theorem 2.2. *(Kim [10]) For sufficiently large n, there exists a triangle-free graph G of order n with $\alpha(G) \leq 9\sqrt{n \log n}$.*

Note that the symbol " $\leq''$ in the inequality above was misprinted as " $\geq''$ in [10]. The following result is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.3. *For sufficiently large n, there exists a non-complete graph G (the complement of a triangle-free graph) of order n, $\gamma_{it}(G) \geq n - \alpha(\overline{G}) \geq n - 9\sqrt{nlog\ n} > \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.*

This disproves Conjecture 1. It is straightforward to check that the complement of the Petersen graph P_{10} is also a counterexample to Conjecture 1. Alon [2] gave some explicit construction of triangle-free graphs with relatively small independence numbers contrast to their orders. The complements of these graphs are also counterexamples to Conjecture 1.

Let $core(G) = \cap\{S : S \in \Omega(G)\}$ be the set of vertices belonging to all maximum independent sets, and let $\xi(G) = |core(G)|$.

Theorem 2.4. *(Boros, Golumbic, and Levit [4]) If G is a connected graph with $\alpha(G) > \alpha'(G)$, then $\xi(G) \geq \alpha(G) - \alpha'(G) + 1$.*

It can be deduced from the theorem above that $\tau_i(G) = 1$ for any connected graph G with $\alpha(G) > \alpha'(G)$. It is an interesting problem for characterizing graphs with $\tau_i(G) = 1$.

Problem 2.5. *What is the best upper bound of $\tau_i(G)$ for graphs G in terms of their order n ?*

Now, we are ready to show Conjecture 2.

Theorem 2.6. *If G is a connected bipartite graph, then $\gamma_{it}(G)$ is either $\gamma(G)$ or $\gamma(G) + 1$.*

Proof. Let S be a $\gamma(G)$-set. If $\alpha(G) > \alpha'(G)$, then by Theorem 2.4, $\xi(G) \geq \alpha(G) - \alpha'(G) + 1 > 0$. So, $S \cup \{v\}$ is an independent transversal dominating set for a vertex $v \in core(G)$, and hence $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq |S \cup \{v\}| = \gamma(G) + 1$.

Next, we consider the case $\alpha(G) \leq \alpha'(G)$. Since G is bipartite,

$$\alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{2} \geq \alpha'(G). \tag{7}$$

Combining (7) with (1), (2), (3), we have

$$\alpha(G) = \alpha'(G) = \beta(G) = \frac{n}{2}. \tag{8}$$

If $\gamma(G) = \beta(G)$, then the result follows from Theorem 1.1. So, we assume that $\gamma(G) < \beta(G)$. Let (X, Y) be the bipartition of G. By the equation (8), we have $|X| = |Y| = \frac{n}{2}$. Thus, $S \cap X \neq \emptyset$ and $S \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Take a vertex $x \in S \cap X$, and let

Ω_x be the set of all maximum independent set of G containing x. In particular, $X \in \Omega_x$. We consider $G - x$. It is clear that $\Omega \setminus \Omega_x = \Omega(G - x)$ and $Y \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_x$. Note that

$$\alpha(G - x) = |Y| = \frac{n}{2} > \frac{n}{2} - 1 = |X \setminus \{x\}| \geq \alpha'(G - x).$$

By Theorem 2.4, $\xi(G - x) > 0$, and let $y \in core(G - x)$. So, $S \cup \{y\}$ is an independent transversal dominating set of G. This shows $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \gamma(G) + 1$.

□

3 Bipartite graphs G with $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$

Hamid [8] obtained the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *(Hamid [8]) For a bipartite graph G with bipartition (X, Y) such that $|X| \leq |Y|$ and $\gamma(G) = |X|$, $\gamma_{it}(G) = \gamma(G) + 1$ if and only if every vertex in X is adjacent to at least two pendant vertices.*

Actually, the theorem above is not complete, see for the counterexample in Figure 1. It is easy to see that for the graph G, $\gamma(G) = 2 = |X|$ and $\gamma_{it}(G) = 3$. However, there is vertex in X, which has no two pendent neighbors.



Figure 1. A counterexample G

Next we present the correct version of the theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a bipartite graph with bipartition (X, Y) such that $|X| \leq |Y|$ and $\gamma(G) = |X|$, then $\gamma_{it}(G) = \gamma(G) + 1$ if and only if every vertex in X is either a pendent vertex, or is adjacent to at least two pendant vertices.*

Proof. First, we show its necessity. By the assumption that $|X| + 1 = \gamma(G) + 1 = \gamma_{it}(G)$ and by Theorem 1.1, we have $|X| \leq \beta(G)$. On the other hand, since X is a vertex covering of G, $\beta(G) \leq |X|$. So, X is a minimum covering of G, implying that Y is a maximum independent set of G.

Next, we show that $\delta(G) = 1$. Suppose $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Since G is bipartite and $\gamma(G) = |X|$, X is a $\gamma(G)$-set. Let $u \in X$ and $v \in N(u)$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 2$, it follows that $S = (X \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$ is a dominating set of G.

Claim 1. S is an independent transversal dominating set of G.

Suppose it is not, and let I be a maximum independent set of G such that $I \cap S = \emptyset$. Since $|I| = \alpha(G) = |Y|$ and $S = (X \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$, we have $I =$

$(Y \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{u\}$. However, since $d(u) \geq 2$, u has a neighbor in I. It contradicts the fact that I is an independent set of G. This proves the claim.

By Claim 1, we have $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq |S| = |X| = \gamma(G)$, contradicting the assumption that $\gamma_{it}(G) = |X| + 1$. This proves $\delta(G) = 1$.

To complete the proof of the necessity, it suffices to show that if $u \in X$ is not a pendent vertex, then u has at least two pendent neighbors. Suppose, on the contrary, that u has at most one pendent neighbor. Since $d(u) \geq 2$, we choose a neighbor v of u with degree as small as possible. Let $S = (X \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$. We show that S is a dominating set of G. If it is not, there exists a vertex $y \in Y \setminus \{v\}$ not dominated by S. Then y must be a pendent vertex and be adjacent to u. Now, u has two pendent neighbors v and y, a contradiction. So, S is a (minimum) dominating set of G. Furthermore, by the similar argument as in the proof of Claim 1, we can show that S is an independent transversal dominating set of G. Again, we have $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq |S| = |X| = \gamma(G)$, contradicting the assumption that $\gamma_{it}(G) = \gamma(G) + 1$. This shows that u has at least two pendent neighbors.

To show its sufficiency, assume that every vertex in X is either a pendent vertex, or is adjacent to at least two pendant vertices. Let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ be the set of all pendent vertices in X for integer $k \geq 0$. Let y_i be the neighbor of x_i in Y for each i. Then $\Omega(G) = \{I : I = (Y \setminus Y') \cup X'\}$, where $X' \subseteq \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ and $Y' = N(X') \cap \{y_1, \ldots, y_k\}$. In particular, if $X' = \emptyset$, then $Y' = \emptyset$, and $I = Y$.

Note that if S is a minimum dominating set of G, then there exists $X' \subseteq \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ such that $S = (X \setminus X') \cup Y'$, where Y' is defined as above. However, $I_S = (Y \setminus Y') \cup X'$ is a maximum independent set such that $S \cap I_S = \emptyset$. It means that no minimum dominating set of G is an independent transversal dominating set, implying that $\gamma_{it}(G) \geq \gamma(G)+1$. On the other hand, by Theorem 2.1, $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \beta(G) + 1 \leq |X| + 1 = \gamma(G) + 1$. We conclude that $\gamma_{it}(G) = \gamma(G) + 1$.

The proof is completed.

□

By Theorem 1.2, $\gamma_{it}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$ for any bipartite graph G without a component of order at most 2. Hamid [8] posed the following problem: characterizing all bipartite graphs G for which $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. In what follows, we partially answer the problem. If G is a connected bipartite graph with $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, then by Theorem 2.6,

$$\frac{n}{2} - 1 \leq \gamma(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}. \tag{9}$$

The corona of a graph G, denoted by $G \circ K_1$, is the graph obtained from G by joining a new vertex v' to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. In 1982, Payan and Xuong [12] and independently, in 1985, Fink, Jacobson, Kinch and Roberts [7] characterized the graphs G of order n with $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$.

Theorem 3.3. *(Fink et al. [7], Payan et al. [12]) For any graph G with even order n having no isolated vertices $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if the components of G*

are C_4 or $H \circ K_1$ for any connected graph H.

Corollary 3.4. *Let G be a connected graph of even order $n \geq 4$. If $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, then $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$.*

Proof. Since $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, by Theorem 3.3, either $G \cong C_4$ or $H \circ K_1$, where H is a connected graph of order $\frac{n}{2} \geq 2$. It is straightforward to check that $\gamma_{it}(C_4) = 2$. If $G \cong H \circ K_1$ for a connected graph of order $\frac{n}{2}$, $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, because the set of pendent vertices is the unique minimum independent transversal dominating set of G. So, the result follows. □

Theorem 3.5. *For a bipartite graph G of even order n with bipartition (X, Y) and without a component of order at most 2, $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, if one of the following cases occurs:*

(1) $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$.

(2) $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2} - 1$, and $|X| = \frac{n}{2} - 1$, $|Y| = \frac{n}{2} + 1$, and every vertex in X is either a pendent vertex, or is adjacent to at least two pendant vertices.

Proof. If $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, by Corollary 3.4, $\gamma_{it}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. If (2) holds, the result follows by Theorem 3.2. □

By a long and difficult proof, Hansberg and Vlolkman [9] were able to characterize even order trees T with $\gamma(T) = \frac{n}{2} - 1$. By Theorems 3.2, 3.3, and 3.5, the bipartite graphs G with $\gamma_{it}(G) = |X| = |Y| = \frac{n}{2}$ and $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2} - 1$ remain to be characterized. Some more effort must be used for completing this task.

4 Independent transversal total domination

A new variant of transversal in graphs was introduced very recently by Martínez, Almira, and Yero [11], called independent transversal total domination. A dominating set S of a graph G is called a *total dominating set* is $G[S]$ has no isolated vertices. The *total dominating number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_t(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum total dominating set of G. Further, a total dominating set S is called an *independent transversal total dominating set* if $S \cap I \neq \emptyset$ for each $I \in \Omega(G)$. The *independent transversal total dominating number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_{tt}(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum independent transversal total dominating set of G. So, for any graph G, $\gamma_{tt}(G) \geq \gamma_{it}(G)$. Cockayne, Dawes and Hedetneimi [6] obtained the following upper on the total domination number of a connected graph in terms of the order of the graph.

Theorem 4.1. *(Cockayne, Dawes and Hedetneimi [6]) If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3}$.*

Brigham, Carrington, and Yitary [5] characterized the connected graphs of order at least 3 with total domination number exactly two-thirds their order.

Among other things, Martínez, Almira, and Yero showed that $\gamma_{tt}(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3}$ for some classes of graphs of order n. Based on these results, they further asked the following open problem:

• Is it true that $\gamma_{tt}(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3}$ for any graph of order n ? If yes, then: Is it true that $\gamma_{tt}(G) = \frac{2n}{3}$ if and only if $\gamma_t(G) = \frac{2n}{3}$?

The answer for the question above is no. By Corollary 2.3, for sufficiently large n, there exists a graph G (the complement of a triangle-free graph) of order n with

$$\gamma_{tt}(G) \geq \gamma_{it}(G) \geq n - 9\sqrt{nlog\ n}.$$

If $\gamma_{tt}(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3}$ holds for any graph G of order n, we have $n - 9\sqrt{nlog\ n} \leq \frac{2n}{3}$, which is impossible for any sufficiently large n.

References

[1] H.A. Ahangar, V. Samodivkin, I.G. Yero, *Independent transversal dominating sets in graphs: Complexity and structural properties*, Filomat 30 (2016) 293-303.

[2] N. Alon, *Explicit Ramsey graphs and orthonormal labelings*, Electron. J. Combin. 1 (1994), Research Paper 12, 8 pp.

[3] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory*, GTM 244, Springer, 2008.

[4] E. Boros, M.C. Golumbic, and V.E. Levit, *On the number of vertices belonging to all maximum stable sets of a graph*, Discrete Math. 124 (2002) 17-25.

[5] R. C. Brigham, J.R. Carrington, and R.P. Yitary, *Connected graphs with maximum total domination number*, J. Combin. Comput. Combin. Math. 34 (2000) 81-96.

[6] E.J. Cockayne, R.M. Dawes and S.T. Hedetneimi, *Total domination in graphs*, Networks 10 (1980) 211-219.

[7] J.F. Fink, M.S. Jacobson, L.F. Kinch, and J. Roberts, *On graphs having domination number half their order*, Period. Math. Huagar. 16 (1985) 287-293.

[8] I.S. Hamid, *Independent transversal domination in graphs*, Disscuss. Math. Graph Theory 32 (2012) 5-17

[9] A. Hansberg, L. Volkmann, *A characterization of even order trees with domination number half their order minus one*, Australas. J. Combin. 44 (2009) 247-254.

[10] J. Kim, *The Ramsey number $R(3,t)$ has the order of magnitute $t^2/logt$*, Random Structures and Algorithms 7 (1995) 173-207.

[11] A.C. Martínez, J.M.S. Almira, I.G. Yero, *On the independence transversal total domination number of graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 219 (2017) 65-73.

[12] C. Payan, N.H. Xuong, *Domination-balanced graphs*, J. Graph Theory 6 (1982) 23-32.